

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, 21-25 and 27-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 11-13, 15-18 and 23 are amended and new claims 28-36 are added. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability. This response should be considered as a reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.111.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8-10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19, 21-24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,510,144 to Dommety et al. (hereafter Dommety) in view of U.S. Patent 6,172,986 to Watanuki et al. (hereafter Watanuki). The Office Action also rejects claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 16, 18 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dommety in view of Watanuki and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,247,058 to Miller et al. (hereafter Miller). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a mobile node, a home agent, and a first foreign agent. The first foreign agent initially receiving said packets from said home agent and storing them in a buffer and additionally sending said stored packets to a second foreign agent included in a second foreign network if said mobile node is moved to said second foreign network, said first foreign agent being included in said first foreign network, wherein said mobile node sends a notification message to said first foreign agent if said mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to said second foreign network.

The Office Action (on page 4) states that Dommety does not specifically show a mobile node sending a notification message to a foreign agent if a mobile node is moved. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 recites that "said mobile node sends a notification

message to said first foreign agent if said mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to said second foreign network."

The Office Action then asserts that Watanuki relates to a mobile node moving from a first IP network to a second IP network. See the paragraph bridging pages 4-5 of the Office Action. The Office Action also cites Watanuki's col. 24, lines 24-40 and col. 36, line 65—col. 37, line 12 for features relating to the movement to another IPv4 network or to an IPv4/v6 network. The Office Action appears to assert that the another IPv4 network and/or the IPv4/v6 network corresponds to a foreign network. However, independent claim 1 is very clear regarding the sending of a notification message to the first foreign agent if the mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to a second foreign network. The Office Action has not addressed this specific feature regarding the movement to a second foreign network.

The cited sections of Watanuki do not relate to the movement of a mobile node from a first foreign network to a second foreign network and the sending of a notification message to the first foreign agent if the mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to a second foreign network. Rather, Watanuki relates to a IPv6 movement registration request message sent to a IPv6 mobile agent. See FIG. 23, step 2366 as well as FIG. 18 showing a mobile agent 1807 (e.g., a home IPv6 Mobile Agent) that receives the IPv6 movement registration request message. This does not correspond to a mobile node sending a notification message to a first foreign agent if the mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to a second foreign network.

More specifically, Watanuki's FIG. 18 shows a home IPv6 mobile agent 1807 and a foreign IPv6 mobile agent 1809. FIG. 18 also relates to a movement from LAN-a 1800 (coupled to home IPv6 mobile agent 1807) to LAN-d 1801 (coupled to foreign IPv6 mobile agent 1809).

Additionally, FIG. 32 shows a home IPv4 home agent 32-6 and a foreign IPv4 mobile agent 3208. The Office Action (on page 5) appears to state that the foreign IPv4 mobile agent may receive a IPv4 movement registration request message. The Office Action cites Watanuki's col. 36, line 65-col. 37, line 12. However, this does not teach that the mobile node sends a notification message to the first foreign agent if the mobile node is moved from a first foreign network to a second foreign network. Watanuki does not suggest movement from a first foreign network to a second foreign network in combination with the sending of a notification message.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Watanuki does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 missing from Dommetry. The Office Action has not provided any reference showing that the mobile node sends a notification message to the first foreign agent if the mobile node is moved from the first foreign network to the second foreign network, as recited in independent claim 1. The Office Action therefore fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites sending a notification message from said mobile node to said first foreign agent when said mobile node moves from the first foreign network to a second foreign network having a second foreign agent, and sending said packets stored in said first buffer to said second foreign agent and storing them in a second buffer if said first foreign agent receives said notification message. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied

references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 15 recites sending a notification message from the mobile node to a first foreign agent if said mobile node moves from a first foreign network to a second foreign network, and determining if said determined mobile node is moved to the second foreign network having a second foreign agent. Independent claim 15 further recites transmitting said packets stored in said buffer to said second foreign agent if said mobile node is moved to said second foreign network and said notification message has been received by the first foreign agent.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 15. Furthermore, the applied references do not teach or suggest transmitting the packets stored in the buffer to the second foreign agent if the mobile node is moved to the second foreign network and the notification message has been received by the first foreign agent. When discussing dependent claim 7, the Office Action (on page 6) appears to state that Dommety (as modified) teaches the features relating to checking whether a notification message has been received in the mobile node. However, the cited section of Dommety does not relate to transmitting of the packets if the mobile node is moved to a second foreign network and the notification message has been received by the first foreign agent. Watanuki does not teach or suggest these missing features. Accordingly, independent claim 15 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 23 recites sending a notification message from a mobile node to the first foreign agent when the mobile node moves from the first foreign network to a second foreign network, and sending said packets in said first buffer to a second foreign agent associated with the second foreign network upon said notification message being received by the first foreign agent. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 23. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 8, 15 and 23 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

For example, dependent claim 30 recites that upon determination that a notification message has been received from another foreign agent, said first foreign agent sends said stored packets to said first foreign agent and deletes said stored packets. See also dependent claim 7. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Dommety and Watanuki do not teach or suggest these features of dependent claim 30. Thus, dependent claims 7 and 30 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Still further, dependent claims 31-36 relate to features of the notification message such as an IP address of the mobile node, an IP address of the first foreign agent and a care-of-address of the mobile node. The applied references (including Watanuki) do not teach or suggest these

Serial No. **09/987,098**  
Reply to Office Action of July 13, 2006

Docket No. **K-0342**

specific features. Watanuki's IPv4 movement registration request message does not include the specifically claimed features of the notification message. Thus, dependent claims 31-36 define patentable subject at least for this additional reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5, 7-13, 15-19, 21-25 and 27-36 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DCO/jlg/kah

**Date: October 13, 2006**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**